



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/813,323

03/29/2004

Ichiro Mitsuyoshi

P/1250-271

5119

2352 7590 04/03/2009
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

LOWE, MICHAEL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3652

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/813,323	Applicant(s) MITSUYOSHI, ICHIRO	
	Examiner Michael Scott Lowe	Art Unit 3652	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Scott Lowe. (3) ____.

(2) Max Moskowitz. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ichiro, Koji, Perlov.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to ask whether if they had changed "element" to "mechanism" in the last amendment, whether it would be allowable. The examiner stated that he could not completely reconsider the claim after final but his impression was that it would strengthen applicant's potential arguments but it would be more helpful to add more limitations than that to clarify the differences between the references and the instant invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael Scott Lowe/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3652